How We Began To Practice for Atom War in Vietnam, P. 6

Any Other Goal Would Be A Surrender In Despair To Racism

"A policy of separation can only relegate Negroes to a permanently inferior economic status. . . . The primary goal must be a single society in which every citizen will be free to live and work according to his capabilities and desires, not his color."

—Report of the Commission on Civil Disorders

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVI, NO. 6 MARCH 18, 1968 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Can 36 Saints Save America?

There is a Jewish legend that God decided to spare the world from destruction for its sins because there were among men 36 saints. These *lamedvavniks* ("the 36ers" in Hebrew) are scattered, obscure, unknown; the Jew, the Gentile, the humble and the learned are represented among them. But because such men exist, God still withholds his angry hand. The legend came to mind when a Congressman, Benjamin Rosenthal, a New York Democrat, circulated a petition pledging members of the House of Representatives to support the recommendations of the Commission on Civil Disorders "and to affirm the priority" of the tasks it outlined over all other "everyday concerns." It was circulated to the 434 members but only 36 signatures came back. 32 Democrats and 4 Republicans.* It may be that 36 saints were enough to save the world. We'll have to scrape up more than that to save America.

Mankind's Old Habits and Ancient Enemies

If one is not to escape into fantasy and demagogy, one must begin by recognizing the dimensions of the challenge offered by the report. Three deep-seated human habits are the main roadblocks. The first is that individually or collectively people are more accustomed to act *after* a catastrophe than before it; there has never been a revolution, including the French and the Russian, which was not preceded by ample warning of the reforms necessary to prevent it. Only the will was lacking and it is lacking today. Whites as a whole are as indifferent to the warnings of race war as are cigarette smokers to the warnings of lung cancer. The second is that people are little disposed to make sacrifices for others, especially for others with whom they cannot identify because they belong to a different class, milieu or ethnic group. The third is that ancient habits and deeply entrenched institutions have made it easy to organize human societies swiftly for those extraordinary spasms of destruction we call war but there are no comparable habits or institutions to mobilize them quickly for any remotely equivalent constructive effort.

Lest We Destroy Our Cities, Too, In Order to "Save" Them

"The Commission believes there is a grave danger that some communities may resort to the indiscriminate and excessive use of force. The harmful effects of over-reaction are incalculable. The Commission condemns moves to equip police departments with mass destruction weapons, such as automatic rifles, machine guns and tanks. Weapons which are designed to destroy, not to control, have no place in densely populated urban communities."

—Commission on Civil Disorders, March 4

Back in the Great Depression, on J. David Stern's newspapers in New York, Philadelphia and Camden, N. J., we used to write editorials urging that we "fight the depression as we fought the war." If we had a Pentagon for social reconstruction, if it directed an army of welfare workers and planners, if they were supported by a network of industries which stood to make a direct profit on their efforts, if they had their bugles and their legends, if the hearts of patriots beat faster at the sound and sight of such mobilization, if in short we had *that* kind of a military-industrial-emotional complex, there would be no doubt about our ability to clean up slums and rescue our black brothers.

But given the realities of human society, there is little wonder at the tepid response. Majority white political leadership is as little disposed to launch the giant effort required to prevent a civil war at home as it is to disentangle from the civil war in Vietnam. We cannot prevent the one without ending the other, but the Commission's only reference to the war is at page 232 (of the Bantam Books edition) where it says that about the time the activities of SNCC and CORE "declined, other issues, particularly Vietnam, diverted the attention of the country, including some Negro leaders, from the issue of equality." The historian will find it incredible that this Commission went no further than that in suggesting a link between Vietnam and the problems of the Ghetto! Apparently predictions of apocalyptic disaster took less courage than any specific comment on what the war was doing to social expenditures. Though baby may burn, the Commissioners were afraid to ignite Johnson.

(Continued on Page Two)

*** Though this was in a sense a test of instant statesmanship, requiring an overnight response to make a press deadline next day and two additional signatures—Kastenmeier (Wis.) and Ashley (Ohio)— have since come in, the 36 is not an unfair index. The 32 Democrats were Adams (Wash.), Bingham (N.Y.), Brown (Cal.), Burton (Cal.), Cohelan (Cal.), Diggs (Mich.), Dent (Pa.), Dow (N.Y.), Edwards (Cal.), Farbstein (N.Y.), Fraser (Minn), Gilbert (N.Y.), Gonzales (Tex.), Holifield (Cal.), Jacobs (Ind.), McCarthy (N.Y.), Minish (N.J.), Mink (Hawaii), Moorhead (Pa.), Nix (Pa.), Ottinger (N.Y.), Price (Ill.), Rees (Cal.), Resnick (N.Y.), Reuss (Wis.), Rhodes (Pa.), Rosenthal (N.Y.), Roybal (Cal.), St. Onge (Conn.), Scheuer (N.Y.), Tenzer (N.Y.) and Wolff (N.Y.). The four Republicans were Button(N.Y.), Halpern (N.Y.), McCloskey (Cal.) and Reid (N.Y.).**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from Page One)

The fatal weakness of the report is that it failed to recommend the establishment of any new agency on which to focus and dramatize responsibility for its diverse recommendations. In one sense, of course, this is everybody's business—but everybody's business always tends to become nobody's business. The answer at the Commission's advance press briefing was that the job was so big that it belongs to the Chief Executive himself. That was hardly a responsive answer. The Chief is also Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces but that does not keep him from having a Secretary of Defense and a Joint Chiefs of Staff. When we had a Marshall Plan for Western Europe, we set up an Economic Reconstruction Administration. That is how one goes about a job one fully intends to accomplish, and to which one really gives overriding priority.

Brush Off at The White House

Two years ago, after a similar report by the White House Conference on Civil Rights, the President at least appointed an interdepartmental committee to consider the recommendations. That was the last ever heard of them. This time Johnson didn't make that much of a gesture. It was a week—in which his silence grew almost scandalous—before he could be prevailed upon to make a comment on it. Then all he would say was that he put it on his recommended reading list—along with his own messages—and that he was already doing "everything that we could conceive of that we had the resources to undertake." He could have made political capital with Negroes out of Nixon's smug Country Club remark the same day that the Commission "blames everybody for the riots except the perpetrators" but again Johnson was silent. Nixon thought the nation needed "more imaginative" approaches than those suggested by the Commission. Maybe like shipping Negroes to the moon? Nixon wants notice served that if "something starts" next summer the law will move in with adequate force "to put down rioting and looting." Attorney General Ramsey Clark has already served such notice quietly on the Rev. Martin Luther King in connection with his forthcoming march on Washington. Johnson will not let himself be outflanked by Nixon on "crime in the streets." On domestic, as in foreign policy, Johnson and Nixon are shaping up as Siamese twins.*

One of the clichés they—and all the rest of our political leadership, including Bobby Kennedy—share in common is that we ought to enlist private enterprise in the war on poverty and racism. One fascinating statistic in the new report should help to explode this comfortable fallacy. Long ago housing was an area in which we did enlist private enterprise by a system of FHA guarantees. The result has been to shift emphasis from public housing for those who need it to better housing for those who can well afford it. "In the 31-year history of subsidized federal housing," the new report says, "only about 800,000 units have been constructed. . . . By

The Disloyal Despair A Stupid War Breeds

"It makes no sense whatsoever to me to be fighting a war 10,000 miles away to impose so-called democracy upon a people who have never known democracy and whose corrupt rulers do not want it, while, at the same time, because of lack of resources, we are not taking the necessary steps to save democracy at home."

—Gruening in the Senate, March 1

"Perhaps the most revealing and disturbing measure of the rioters' anger at the social and political system is their response to a question asking whether they thought 'the country was worth fighting for in the event of a major world war.' Of the self-reported rioters, 39.4 percent in Detroit and 52.8 percent in Newark shared the view that it was not. . . ."

—Chapter 2 of the Report on Civil Disorders

*** Anyone taken in by Nixon's sudden pledge to end the war if elected should read the interview he gave Robert B. Semple, Jr., in the New York Times March 11. He specified that he means an "honorable" bargain that would ensure "self-determination" for South Vietnam, that could not be construed as a "defeat for the United States" or as a "reward for aggression" and that would not "encourage further wars of liberation" in the Pacific. Johnson, too, is ready to make peace if only Ho Chi Minh will quietly turn himself in.**

Some Glimpses of the Realities Behind The Headlines About Rioting and Snipers

"In predominately Negro precincts [in one particular city], over three-fourths of the white policemen expressed prejudice or highly prejudiced attitudes towards Negroes. Indeed, close to one-half of all the police officers in predominately Negro high crime rate areas showed extreme racial prejudice against Negroes. What do I mean by extreme racial prejudice? I mean that they describe Negroes . . . in the terms of the animal kingdom. . . ."

—Professor Albert Reiss, Director of the U. of Michigan Center for Research on Social Organization, testifying before the Commission on Civil Disorders.

"By Monday afternoon, July 17, state police and National Guard forces were withdrawn [from Newark]. That evening, a Catholic priest saw two Negro men walking down the street. They were carrying a case of soda and two bags of groceries. An unmarked car with five police officers got out of the car. Accusing the Negro men of looting, the officers made them put the groceries on the sidewalk, then kicked the bags open, scattering their contents all over the street. Telling the men, 'Get out of here,' the officers drove off. The Catholic priest went across the street to help gather up the groceries. One of the men turned to him: 'I've just been back from Vietnam two days,' he said, 'and this is what I get. I feel like going home and getting a rifle and shooting the cops'."

—Chapter 1 of the Commission Report

"Action by police officers accounted for 20 and, very likely, 21 of the deaths [in Detroit]. Action by the National Guard for seven, and, very likely, nine. Action by the Army for one. Two deaths were the result of action by store owners. Four persons died accidentally. Rioters were responsible for two, and perhaps three of the deaths."

—Same.

"We used things in our leads and headlines during the riot I wish we could have back now, because they were wrong and they were bad mistakes. . . . We used the words 'sniper kings' and 'nests of snipers.' We found out when we were able to get our people into those areas and get them out from under the cars that these sniper kings and these nests of snipers were the constituted authorities shooting at each other, most of them. There was just one confirmed sniper in the entire eight-day riot. . . ."

—A newspaper editor testifying before the Commission's Poughkeepsie Conference, Chapter 15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comparison, over a period only 3 years longer, FHA insurance guaranties have made possible the construction of over 10,000,000 middle and upper income units." The FHA was a bonanza for the speculative builder. Private enterprise fought public housing for the poor because slum housing is highly profitable. The slum generally is a high profit market for inferior goods. It is self-delusion to appeal to "the private sector" to eradicate what it profits from. It will not volunteer to profit less.

The Taxes The Rich Escape

Everywhere in the underdeveloped world we preach this in the form of tax and land reform. But we are unwilling to practice it at home. Here, as surely as in Latin America, to close the huge loopholes by which the great fortunes escape taxation would free billions of dollars for social reconstruction. Here, as in Latin America, the breakup of large mechanized landed estates, particularly in the South, would give landless whites and blacks a way to become self-supporting and self-respecting and keep them out of the ghettoes. The only difference between our cities and Latin America's is that there the poor swarm in shanty towns at the edges of the cities while here they pile up in misery at their very core. Here as there if the poor are to suffer less the rich must pay more—in taxes and in privileges and in lower rates of profit. It is time to act at home on the advice we hand out so liberally abroad.

If the burning in Watts, Newark and Detroit did not awaken the country, neither will the warnings of this new report. Predictions of disaster have become so common they seem merely to whet everybody's expectation. As in war between nations, hate and fear build up to the point where men on both sides look forward to the outbreak for release of tension. Both sides are stocking arms, as if in caricature of our national reliance on more and better weapons as "deterrence." "How can we as a people," the new report asks, "end the resort to violence while we build a better society?" The obvious answer is to set a better example by ending our own resort to violence in Vietnam and using the resources for reconstruction at home. How can we preach non-violence to our colored people when we practice violence as a national policy against colored peoples abroad and unofficially through the police at home; when we as a nation are unwilling to submit disputes to some kind of international adjudication but insist on our own way—or else, i.e. the "or else" of napalm and B-52s and maybe (we like to keep them guessing) tactical nuclear weapons as well? The Gospel says he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword. What we need is a new crusade—a pilgrimage into every town and city preaching world and racial peace—to bring the lesson home to our fellow white citizens before the country is torn apart, to awaken (as Lincoln would say) the angels of their better natures, to open their minds and hearts to the humiliation and the misery white supremacy imposes on colored men in our society. Is it too late?

The Private Bias Behind the Public Stance

"No fewer than thirty of the witnesses before the [Civil Disorders] Commission referred to a role for the private sector in meeting those urban problems which contribute to civil disorder. We believe that these widely-shared sentiments about the role of the business community are more than mere rhetoric. The private sector has shown its concern and capacity."

—The Commission's Private Enterprise Panel March 3

"What political leaders ought to tell urban Negroes is this: The doors of opportunity have been closed on no one (which is far nearer the truth than the opposite). Statistics show that vast numbers of Negroes raise themselves from poverty every year. There is no reason others cannot do likewise. Doing it, while the Government may be able to assist in a few little ways, involves mostly individual effort. It's up to you, baby."

—Editorial in The Wall St. Journal, *March 4*

McCarthy Draws The Sharp Contrast Between LBJ's Budget and Negro Needs

"Nearly two-thirds of the 12 million Negroes now living in our nation's cities live in areas marked by urban blight and deterioration. The President's commission has recommended that six million new units be constructed for low and moderate income housing in the next five years; six hundred thousand of these homes would be built in 1969. But two weeks ago the President issued his call for new housing. He proposed the construction of only 2.35 million units over the next five years, with three hundred thousand to be built next year.

"Federal statistics show that the male Negro is two times as likely to be unemployed, and three times more likely to be working at an unskilled occupation than his white counterpart. The President's commission recommended the creation of more than 500,000 jobs in 1969, 300,000 of them to be financed by private industry and 250,000 by the public sector. But two weeks ago the President issued his call for more jobs and proposed only 100,000 jobs in 1969, all to be financed by private business, but the government reports more than 700,000 non-whites are out of work in the nation today. Without a massive redirection, the future is bleak. . . .

"The President's commission reported that the typical rioter was a teenager or young adult, a high school dropout who was a life long resident of the city in which he rioted. According to a report last week by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 32.7% of the job-age non-white youth are out of work in the nation's 20 largest cities. What is the Administration's answer? In recent weeks President Johnson has ordered the Neighborhood Youth Corps to help 170,000 fewer youngsters in the coming year; he has shut down 16 Job Corps centers; and he also has cut 35 million dollars from the emergency summer job program approved by Congress last year.

"Many of the rioters were high-school dropouts, destined from birth to a life of poor education, poor jobs, and segregated housing. The President's Commission noted that schools have failed to 'provide the educational experience which could overcome the effects of discrimination and deprivation. This failure is one of the persistent sources of grievance and resentment within the Negro community.' The President's answer has been to cut federal aid for education. Of 2.7 billion dollars authorized last year by Congress for aid to elementary and secondary schools, the President expects to spend only 1.2 billion dollars, or about 44% of what is available. . . .

"But we cannot solve any problems if we persist in wasting manpower, money and moral energy in the war in Vietnam."

—McCarthy at Dartmouth College, March 3

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the Senate's Most Vigorous Upsurge Yet Against the Vietnam War

Fulbright: Tonkin Gulf Resolution Void Because Fraudulently Obtained

FULBRIGHT: Insofar as the consent of this body is said to derive from the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, it can only be said that that resolution like any contract based on misrepresentation, in my opinion, is null and void. . . . If the Administration contemplates an expansion now, a major expansion, or a step-up of the war, it has the obligation, in my opinion to consult the Congress, especially with the Senate and obtain its advance approval. . . . Is there going to be debate, or will the people suddenly be confronted with an increasing war burden and want to know why and to what end?

CASE (*R. N.J.*): . . . it is now a question as to whether or not the war is winnable without the destruction of South Vietnam and much of American might itself. . . .

MILLER (*R. Iowa*): If at that time somebody had told me that the conduct of a war after the Gulf of Tonkin resolution would be a prolonged war strategy . . . I would not have supported the resolution [Miller is a hawk]. . . .

HATFIELD (*R. Oregon*): . . . I do not believe that we should sit idly by or, in the name of blind patriotism, say that we endorse everything a President does. . . . Congress should say to the President very clearly that . . . if he deems it absolutely necessary . . . to expand the war, we should share in the decision making . . . it should not be the decision of one man. . . .

CHURCH (*D. Idaho*): During the Second World War I served in Asia. I came away persuaded that Asia is an endless morass and that the day of Western control of Asian affairs had passed. . . . We are the last [Western power] to keep a foothold on the mainland of Asia. Sometimes I think we are fascinated by this baited trap . . . where huge populations wait to engulf us, and legions of young Americans are being beckoned to their graves. . . . If we fail now to assert our constitutional responsibilities, we shall have only ourselves to blame for any disaster. . . .

ROBERT KENNEDY (*D. N.Y.*): . . . Every time we have had difficulty over a period of the past 7 years, over the period during which I was in the executive branch, and since I left the executive branch, the answer has always been to escalate the conflict. It has always been to send more troops. And at the time we sent the larger number of troops, or increased the bombing, we have always stated that . . . victory is just ahead of us. . . . Victory is not just ahead of us. It was not in 1961 or 1962 when I was one of those who predicted there was a light at the end of the tunnel. . . . More troops, or increasing the bombing, is not the answer. . . .

Moreover there is a question of our moral responsibility. Are we like the God of the Old Testament that we can decide in Washington, D. C., what cities, what towns, what hamlets in Vietnam are going to be destroyed? . . . Do we have that authority to kill tens and tens of thousands of people because we say we have a commitment to the South Vietnamese people? But have they been consulted—in Hue, in Ben Tre, or in the other towns that have been destroyed? . . .

As to our own interests in Vietnam, could not the Germans or the Russians have argued the same thing before the beginning of World War II—that they had the right to go into Poland, into Esthonia, into Latvia, into Lithuania, because they needed them for their own protection . . . as a buffer?

When our own Marines are going into Hue to recapture it, do we have the right to stand by and merely look at thousands of South Vietnamese looting Hue that has been liberated by us? . . . When this was brought to the attention of the President, he said that there was stealing in Beaumont, Tex. If there is stealing in Beaumont, Tex., it is not bringing about the death of American boys. . . .

TOWER (*R. Tex.*): The implication has been made that we have suffered a series of very great defeats in Vietnam. I do not accept that thesis. . . .

FULBRIGHT: If we did not suffer any defeat or difficulty, why is there a request for 200,000 additional troops?

TOWER: Because now the Administration is doing what a number of us have been saying for 2½ years—that you cannot win a war by a gradual response . . . that the only way . . . is through massive air and sea superiority . . . with the maximum of impact. . . .

HARTKE (*D. Ind.*): . . . not only are our young men being sacrificed at an increasing rate but . . . the whole economic system of the U.S. is now in danger of collapsing . . . just as a leach bleeds a person to death, this country is being bled of its treasure, its manpower and its young people. . . .

TOWER: . . . The Soviets may be an unpleasant people, but they are not foolish, and they are not going to destroy the Soviet Union as a viable society by initiating thermonuclear war because of what we do in Southeast Asia. . . .

TYDINGS (*D. Md.*): Our forefathers who fought against colonial rule rejected the idea that one person could commit the young men of a nation to battle without the full and free consent of the people of that nation. . . .

NELSON (*D. Wis.*): I remember standing here and having one of our distinguished colleagues say, "And what do you

Why Doves Coo In Wall Street

"One of the more impressive demonstrations of anti-war feeling is under way these days in about the last place that peace marchers would look for it—Wall Street. It's a demonstration without banners, slogans or draft-card burnings. But it's unmistakable. On the increasingly rare occasions that rumors of Vietnam peace negotiations circulate, stock prices go up sharply —and that's about the only time they do go up. Whenever the fighting intensifies or threatens to intensify, investors sell shares in enough volume to produce a sharp price break. . . .

Some Wall Street descriptions of the potential blessings of peace sound surprisingly New Leftish, too. "Peace in Vietnam would produce a dramatic upsurge in the market—a psychological explosion that would push the Dow-Jones industrial average over 1,000," says Eldon A. Grimm, senior vice president of Walston & Co. . . . Other analysts note that the defense industries already are out of favor with many investors—perhaps the strongest of all indications of Wall Street's anti-war mood. "Strange as it may seem, in view of the faster tempo of the war, there is a definite prejudice against stocks with a high national defense emphasis," says Lucien O. Hooper of W. E. Hutton & Co.

—*Victor J. Hillery*, Wall St. Journal, *March 6*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

know about military policy that makes you so much wiser than our military experts that you can say this will be a big war?" The fact of the matter is that the instinct of those of us who opposed this policy was far better than the military expertise of those who told us we ought to get involved. . . . The military made a colossal misjudgment. . . .

The question is: Do you want to go up to 1.5 million men or 2 million men? . . . Or do you want to do everything possible to negotiate, to deescalate. . . . You may militarily suppress the guerrillas. You will not wipe them out. They do not have to fight when they do not want to fight. You suppress the insurgency and you sit there with 2 million men. And when you leave, they are back again. . . .

I object to the interpretation put upon the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, that it was a vote by the Senate, with only two dissenting votes [Morse and Gruening], to authorize an open-ended expansion of this war. . . . If the Senator from Arkansas . . . had said that the resolution authorizes a ground commitment of an unlimited number of troops . . . he would have been defeated by 80% of the votes in the Senate. . . .

FULBRIGHT: I believe the Senator is speaking of a debate on Aug. 7, 1964. Of course, I was relying upon the truthfulness of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. At that time I was not very experienced in dealing with these gentlemen, and believed everything they told us. . . . I also believed the President of the United States when he said that his purpose was not to fight a war in Asia with American boys. I have his exact statement in my notes. . . .

MANSFIELD (*D. Mont.*): We are in the wrong place, and we are fighting the wrong kind of war. . . . We cannot recall the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. If I knew what I knew today, I would have voted against it. . . . The war is in danger of becoming more open-ended than just Vietnam. . . . No one knows how or where it will end. . . . There will be . . . no victory for anyone, only a legacy of . . . hatred and horror. . . . Let us play down the possibility of a military solution and play up the possibility of an honorable negotiated settlement.

MCGOVERN (*D. S. Dak.*): . . . Our policy represents the greatest and most unfortunate miscalculation in our country's history. . . . It does not really require very much courage or patriotism to stand on the floor of the Senate and cheer our troops on to their death. . . .

LAUSCHE (*D. Ohio*): I suggest to the Chairman [Fulbright] that instead of talking . . . he introduce a resolution . . . one, to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution; two, if he does not want to do that, then a resolution to adopt the Gavin enclave recommendation; and, three, if he does not want to do either . . . then to present a resolution to declare that we pull out of South Vietnam and raise the white flag of surrender. . . .

CLARK (*D. Pa.*): The war in Vietnam is at a stalemate which neither side can convert into a military victory without leaving the country—and perhaps the world—in ruins. I for one have felt we should cease the bombing of the North and pursue de-escalation in the South. . . .

GORE (*D. Tenn.*): I should like to address a few remarks today to the subject of a Senator's duty to dissent. . . . It was in 1775 that Patrick Henry spoke before the Second Revolutionary Convention in Virginia. . . . It was in that speech that he uttered his famous plea for liberty or for death. . . . It is not to that phrase to which I wish to make reference. I shall quote him more in point on the question before the Senate. He said: ". . . in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. . . ."

—*From the Congressional Record of March 7.*

Not the Road to Reconciliation

We urge support for Teddy Kolleck, Mayor of Jerusalem, in his criticism of the Israeli military for blowing up a house in Arab Jerusalem because they suspected it had sheltered an Arab terrorist; the blast created widespread damage in an Arab neighborhood. The "get tough" policies of the Israeli military threaten, like those of our own military in Vietnam, to increase opposition by hitting the innocent along with the guilty. We also believe the State Department justified in calling Israel's attention to the fact that it is a party to the 1949 Geneva convention which forbids "collective penalties" and punishment without proof in occupied territories. This was intended to prevent what the Nazis did in World War II. Such practices can only embitter the Arabs and make reconciliation more difficulty. We add, as a sour footnote, that our own practices in Vietnam—notably "free strike" zones—also violate the spirit of the '49 convention by subjecting innocent civilians, too, to shell fire and napalm.

Why U.S. and NATO Policy Leave The Greeks No Alternative to Revolution

"The official recognition by the U. S. government of the brutal, dictatorial regime in Greece came to the democratic forces of our country, indeed to the Greek people at large, as a shock. But what was even more shocking was the open and enthusiastic support given by NATO, in the person of Admiral Horatio Rivero, to the dictator of Greece—not to mention the fact that the junta chief has been officially feted on the U.S.S. Roosevelt, as an indication of warmth and friendship. . . .

"What are the Greeks supposed to say to all this? How are they supposed to react? Our country joined the alliance in order to safeguard its freedom. And now we are faced with the bitter fact that the very organization we joined in order to protect this freedom is arming to the teeth the military mafia which usurped the government of our country and subjugated our people. . . .

"The colonels' game is twofold. At home, they constitute the most brutal, the most barbaric regime Greece has ever seen. It is well documented by now, thanks to Amnesty International, that tortures which defy the imagination, and terrorism are the daily diet of the Greeks.

This shaky government resorts to terror as the only means for its survival. Abroad, they wish to give the impression of a benign and transitional government. But benign they are not. Nor do they intend to be transitional. For it should be clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that all this talk about a plebiscite on a democratic constitution followed by elections is material for the public relations firms they are hiring almost everywhere in the west to plead their sinful cause. . . .

"There is no doubt that, if the junta were isolated morally, militarily and economically, it would collapse of its own weight. Since, however, a number of western governments have chosen to follow the example of the U.S. government in recognizing and supporting this brutal dictatorship, the Greek people have no other alternative but to organize their own resistance against the junta."

—Andreas Papandreou to A.D.A. in Washington, March 9

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A French Correspondent's Exclusive Account of A Nuclear War Game Near San Diego

How the U.S. Marines Prepared in 1965 for Atomic War in Vietnam

In the summer of 1965, Marcel Giuglaris, Tokyo correspondent of France-Soir, *the largest evening paper in Paris, was taken on a VIP tour of U.S. Navy installations in California and the Pacific. In his paper of Aug. 3, 1965, he described this mock battle preparation for the use of atomic weapons in Vietnam. We phoned the Navy Department, reached the officer who arranged the Giuglaris tour and were assured that his stories had proven accurate. Here is the account in abridged form:*

By Marcel Giuglaris

The United States is prepared to use tactical atomic bombs in South Vietnam. The President could authorize their use in case a region like Pleiku or Kontum in the highlands, for example, came completely under Viet Cong control.

I was the only civilian and journalist among 200 officers of the Pacific fleet and marine units gathered to direct and carry out maneuvers on a scale-model plan. The operation took place in the war-room of the Center of the Command and Training of Amphibious Forces of the Pacific at Coronado, near San Diego—the biggest American naval base on the west coast. In this room the staff of the amphibious forces in the Pacific was assembled.

A Model of Vietnam

At our feet, on the ground, done with extraordinary accuracy was a scale model reconstruction of Vietnam and the surrounding sea. On the sea was a veritable Armada. Farthest from the coast was the Admiral's flagship which, with its "heart" of telecommunications connected to Washington and to all the ships, planes and landing forces, constituted the "brains" of the operation. Around the flagship were protecting destroyers. Ahead, nearer to the coasts were the transport of assault troops.

From the flagship came the order, "Begin the attack." Suddenly, the sea was covered with landing craft which emerged from the mother ships. From the decks of their transport ships, Sikorsky helicopters each with twenty-six men aboard took off for the far end of the beach to disembark.

In back were the mountains, swarming with Viet Cong. Without doubt, the U. S. attack was a surprise, but they were already preparing their defense and counter-attack.

"To Prevent The Ultimate Crime"

"To our widows and orphans, to our civilians mangled and burned beyond recognition, to our dead rotting unburied in sun and rain, we owe nothing less than the truth: this is not a struggle for freedom or democracy; it has become a war of genocide. . . . We urgently appeal to the world community, through the United Nations, to condemn . . . the use of chemical warfare, napalm and anti-personnel bombs. Finally, to prevent the ultimate crime against mankind, we ask the General Assembly to forbid the use of nuclear weapons by any party in this conflict."

—Appeal by South Vietnamese students in American Universities, March 1.

H plus 6. Suddenly the sky cleared. The silence was almost total. Only the tanks continued to fire. Then, from the far end of the room, came a model of a jet plane attached to a steel wire which whistled as the plane moved. At the same time, a voice announced on the loudspeaker: "The President has authorized use of tactical atomic weapons for annihilating the area in the rear where the concentration of enemy troops is located."

The metal wire made a shrill noise. The bomb, dropped from the plane, exploded. The shape of a mushroom rose over the model. Everything happened so quickly that surprise was complete. Around me, all Adams apples rose. The superior officers stood stiffly. The Marines looked at each other. Someone breathed loudly.

Was this a simple staff exercise? No, it was infinitely more than that, for it was only one of numerous exercises which have taken place on the west coast since the beginning of the year. In Washington, at the Department of Defense, I was always told in informed circles that, "Since spring, 1965, the war in Vietnam isn't just a continuation of the war in Indochina. We think we are involved in a serious business which we have taken in hand, and which we have definitely decided to win. We refuse to accept any more any inherited notions about the war. We don't want to run the risk of Dien Bien Phu."

The Index for 1967 is now ready—You can have a copy free if you send a stamped, long addressed envelope—We advise keeping it and back issues in a claw binder—There is much in the Weekly you won't find elsewhere

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 3/18/68

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED